



## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

---

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2009-2010 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2004.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

**DISTRICT** (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: (per district designation)

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| 11        | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
| 2         | Middle/Junior high schools        |
| 3         | High schools                      |
| 0         | K-12 schools                      |
| <b>16</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>                      |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 3536

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- ☐ Urban or large central city  
☐ Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area  
☐ Suburban  
☒ Small city or town in a rural area  
☐ Rural

4. 4 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

| Grade                                 | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|---------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK                                  | 15         | 8            | 23          | 6     | 30         | 25           | 55          |
| K                                     | 33         | 26           | 59          | 7     |            |              | 0           |
| 1                                     | 34         | 18           | 52          | 8     |            |              | 0           |
| 2                                     | 35         | 23           | 58          | 9     |            |              | 0           |
| 3                                     | 30         | 24           | 54          | 10    |            |              | 0           |
| 4                                     | 27         | 31           | 58          | 11    |            |              | 0           |
| 5                                     | 29         | 35           | 64          | 12    |            |              | 0           |
| TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL |            |              |             |       |            |              | 423         |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 15 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
0 % Asian  
0 % Black or African American  
48 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
37 % White  
0 % Two or more races  
100 % **Total**

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 4 %

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

|     |  |       |
|-----|--|-------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.   | 15    |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 0     |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].   | 15    |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1.  | 428   |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).                          | 0.035 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.   | 3.505 |

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 1 %

Total number limited English proficient 4

Number of languages represented: 2

Specify languages:

Tiwa and Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 47 %

Total number students who qualify: 200

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 14 %

Total Number of Students Served: 58

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>4</u> Autism                | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>0</u> Deafness              | <u>2</u> Other Health Impaired                 |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u>9</u> Specific Learning Disability          |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>9</u> Speech or Language Impairment         |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment    | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>3</u> Mental Retardation    | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>31</u> Developmentally Delayed              |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

|                                       | Number of Staff  |                  |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                       | <u>Full-Time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
| Administrator(s)                      | <u>1</u>         | <u>0</u>         |
| Classroom teachers                    | <u>24</u>        |                  |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>11</u>        | <u>4</u>         |
| Paraprofessionals                     | <u>9</u>         |                  |
| Support staff                         | <u>12</u>        |                  |
| Total number                          | <u>57</u>        | <u>4</u>         |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 18 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

|                          | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 95%       | 95%       | 95%       | 95%       | 95%       |
| Daily teacher attendance | 98%       | 98%       | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       |
| Teacher turnover rate    | 2%        | 4%        | 0%        | 2%        | 2%        |
| Student dropout rate     | %         | %         | %         | %         | %         |

Please provide all explanations below.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| Graduating class size                      |  |   |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university |  | % |
| Enrolled in a community college            |  | % |
| Enrolled in vocational training            |  | % |
| Found employment                           |  | % |
| Military service                           |  | % |
| Other (travel, staying home, etc.)         |  | % |
| Unknown                                    |  | % |
| <b>Total</b>                               |  | % |

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

Bosque Farms Elementary School is located approximately four miles north of Los Lunas in the quiet village of Bosque Farms. Our school has very strong ties to the community and draws strength from a large base of parent volunteers who work at the site daily. Our school serves the areas of Bosque Farms, portions of Peralta, and the Isleta Reservation. The student body is a diverse socioeconomic, cultural, and ethnic representation of the valley. Each year our classes are filled to capacity, and we have a waiting list for students who would like to attend our school.

The original adobe structure school was built as a WPA project in 1936 serving first through eighth grade. The first hot lunch program in Valencia County was implemented in 1940 at our school when it was an independent school, not yet affiliated with Los Lunas Schools. Our beautiful tree-lined campus is located on 4.3 acres in the heart of the Bosque Farms community. In 1987, a new classroom addition was built and the main building and library were remodeled. The library highlights an original territorial style with open vigas and a "kiva" reading pit. A new kindergarten wing and cafeteria were constructed in 2006. Four years ago our school was in the first group of Los Lunas elementary schools to change the structure of our elementary from a K-4 to a K-6 model which began a steady climb in enrollment. Because of our academic success and the addition of 5th and 6th, our school has grown to capacity. During the summer of 2009, we were awarded 11.2 million dollars to remodel our current buildings and build a two-story classroom addition. The construction necessitated our school to move off campus for the 2009-2010 school year and for the first half of the 2010-2011 school year. We are presently located on a temporary portable campus. The dedication of our staff was demonstrated when we had to move our entire campus in a two week period right before school began this year. The tremendous pressure the time constraint placed on us would have been overwhelming to most ordinary school employees. Our staff did whatever was needed to accomplish this monumental task with minimal problems. The staff and students have adopted this new campus as their own and continue to achieve excellent academic gains. Even though the conditions here are less than perfect, we are all happy and grateful for what we've dubbed "Camp Bosque Farms".

Our school mission statement is "Every Student, Every Day." Our team strives to prepare our students for rich academic success. We feel we must concentrate on each student and their academic needs each day in order to teach them effectively. We have led the district in test proficiency performance for the last three years. We believe this is due to a highly committed staff and very involved parents. Our school implemented a rewards program for proficient performance on the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment. This was a partnership with the Isleta Native American Pueblo just north of our town. This unique program is an example of how committed our community is to our students' success.

Our diverse staff is composed of teachers ranging from veterans with over 25 years of experience to novices in their first-year of teaching with the average tenure about 13 years. The entire team is highly qualified and shares a strong commitment to this school and its students.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### 1. **Assessment Results:**

The data for the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment for Bosque Farms Elementary has shown steady growth over the last five years. 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 data only includes scores for students in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade because we didn't have 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> those years. We added 5<sup>th</sup> 2006-2007 school year and then 6<sup>th</sup> 2007-2008.

Over the five year span, we have increased proficiency 15% in reading scores and 41% in math scores in the all student tested category. When we view the individual sub-group scores, we see this same trend repeated. The largest individual sub-group gain came from our Native American subgroup in reading with 24% gain and a 37% gain in math scores. We attribute this large gain to our concentrated effort to work with the Isleta Pueblo tribal council, parents of the Native American students and the students themselves. Their success was set as a goal by our school Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) for years 2005 through 2009. The narrowing of that achievement gap caused us to be able to remove them from the EPSS as a separate goal and include them with the general student population this year.

Our lowest scoring sub-group is our students with disabilities. We started low at 15% and moved up to around 20% but hovered in that area for the next three years. Last year we decided to make some changes in our inclusion program and saw a fairly large jump in our scores. We adopted a new tier III intervention this year and are hoping for another gain this year.

In New Mexico, the State Public Education Department (PED) has identified annual goal cut scores for student achievement. Student scale score intervals identify those students (by grade level) scoring at beginning steps, nearing proficiency, proficient or advanced. Percentages of students scoring proficient or advanced determine if a school meets Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). In New Mexico, the AMO increases incrementally each year, until 100% of students must achieve proficiency in 2014. For the school year 2008-2009, schools needed to reach 41% proficient in math and 55% proficient in reading to meet AYP goal. The state website for assessment results is located at

<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/AssessmentAccountability/AcademicGrowth/NMSBA.html>

### 2. **Using Assessment Results:**

We begin the year by looking at the previous year's New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA) data to pinpoint weak academic areas for each grade and then dig further into the data to determine weak instruction areas for each teacher. This helps our teachers modify lessons to make sure that they reconfigure their approach to cover the content. The areas that are considered weak in each grade are built into our plan for the year. We determine what needs to change and then implement the change.

During the first month of school we administer the short-cycle assessment provided by Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) This assessment provides data on each student and shows us the areas where there might be gaps. Classroom teachers can use this information to plan their small group instruction for both reading and math. Student deficit areas are addressed in the classroom, and in other special programs such as tier II interventions. We administer the MAP test again in December to get an idea of how students are doing and how we can further tailor the instruction for the student. Parents are also apprised of the progress of the student at this time. During the last of the school year we give the test once again to determine growth for the year and decide what areas students need to concentrate on during the summer break. We provide this information to parents with any resources they would like to help the students work on these areas.



Each grade level teacher meets in a professional learning community (plc) to plan and look at student work each week. They have begun to come up with common assessments to use across their grade. This helps them determine what students know and are able to do. The collaboration in these groups helps the students by providing help beyond their classroom teacher. Each teacher can provide their expertise in helping design lessons to assure that students learn the content. Teachers use this and other anecdotal information to provide as much individualized attention as possible.

We also use this assessment information to send to the parents to suggest areas that they can help their students work on. We've found that some of the parents who take these suggestions seriously have helped their students bring their scores up. We volunteer resources to help these parents address these needs either online or with workbooks and lessons that we can give them.

### **3. Communicating Assessment Results:**

Los Lunas Schools use standards based report cards to communicate student mastery four times a year. At every 4 ½ weeks between report card periods we also send home official progress reports. Bosque Farms Elementary communicates assessment results regularly each year. We begin each new school year with the previous year's New Mexico Standards Based Assessment sent home to families. We send these individual results along with a brochure we developed to help parents be aware of what their student knows and understands compared to what they are supposed to know and understand. We use the first set of data from our short-cycle assessment to inform the parents at a parent/teacher conference early in the fall. This helps them to understand what is going on in the classroom individually for their student.

As the fall progresses, the summative data we compile from classroom assessments is communicated to parents through notes and notices in the student agenda. Parents are free to request a conference with the teacher at any time they see something concerning in this data.

After Christmas break our second short-cycle assessment is administered. The results of this test are used to determine how much growth each student has made since the beginning of the year. These results are communicated through a second parent-teacher conference. Decisions are made at this conference as to whether or not the student is on track to master the objectives for their current grade. If there is a question about being able to master them, teachers and parents meet with a Student Intervention Team to determine if it would be beneficial for the student to repeat the grade or if there are interventions that could help the student in the classroom.

At the end of the year our short-cycle assessment is administered again to determine growth for the entire year. These results are sent home with the student with suggestions for supplemental work for the student to work on during the summer.

### **4. Sharing Success:**

Bosque Farms Elementary has been part of a professional learning community of other elementary schools for the last 3 years. It began as a group of principals who met together weekly to share successes and plans for the year. This blossomed into professional learning communities in each of the schools. We are able to share successful interventions and programs with each other throughout the schools and then to the rest of our district.

We also have a student intervention team who is leading the district in procedures and policy making concerning the response to intervention process and how it is implemented in our schools. Our academic coach shares strategies that we use at our school with other coaches in the district. An example of this was our test preparation for the New Mexico Standards Based assessment. We decided that we would use our short-cycle assessment results to determine the lowest performance areas for each of our four grades that take the NMSBA. We constructed a test based on these weak areas and used it to give practice SBA tests before we

take the real test in April. Our school made up these exams and shared them with any other elementary school who wanted them.

We have a close relationship with the local newspaper which we exploit whenever possible. Every time we have some success, we have the paper visit to take photos and write a story about it. We've also had one of the Albuquerque television stations come to our school on two different locations to film a story about a successful and unique incentive program. When we are named a Blue Ribbon recipient we look forward to having them out again.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

### 1. Curriculum:

The Los Lunas Schools Curriculum is aligned with the New Mexico Standards and Benchmarks. Our curriculum materials follow the core and are supplemented with essential activities and manipulative materials for math. Each area is described fully under different questions in this application.

The reading program is guided reading and is highly individualized in each classroom. A student's individual reading level is used to provide their instruction. Each class has a leveled library as does the school's academic coach. These are in addition to our regular library so there is no shortage of materials for the students to read.

The math program is Investigations by Terc. Our teachers are still learning this curriculum and have ongoing professional development in order to implement it successfully. During our implementation we've found that unless a student has had this program since kindergarten, when they are in the upper grades, the materials assume that they have prior knowledge that ours do not have. We have implemented the program with the understanding that when we find these areas that our students are missing essential skills, we provide whatever we need to insure that they get the necessary content. We will continue with this method until we are sure that all students have had the essential instruction in Investigations before abandoning other supplemental materials. We experienced a 12 point gain in our math scores on our NMSBA last year. We believe that this extraordinary gain is due to this supplemental approach we are undertaking. Other schools in our district which didn't experience the same kinds of gains are doing 100% investigations.

Writing, Social Studies and Science standards are all addressed in the context of the reading instruction. There are things like projects and science experiments which are addressed in their own special lessons. Our students also attend a Science Camp in 5<sup>th</sup> grade. This unique experience takes the students away from the school setting to spend the night at a camp and experience the science standards first hand. We have different real world scientists come to the camp and present how science is used in their jobs. Years after the experience, we have had students come back to the school and tell us how much that experience impacted their love for science.

At Bosque Farms Elementary students are looked at as individuals who are great contributors to our community of learners. Teachers consider each diverse learner and their learning styles. It is through these considerations that curriculum is planned in collaboration with students to assure student's needs are being met. Though consistent adopted curriculum and frameworks, such as math Investigations and comprehensive literacy are in place throughout the school, how the curriculum is presented and how students are engaged differs from classroom to classroom based on the unique needs of the students.

We believe it is essential that students are given opportunities to learn in an investigative environment. Curriculum is based on the foundation that learning is not restricted to verbal and mathematical abilities. Students have strengths in different ways and as part of the community within our school; we encourage each student to share these strengths to help us all grow as learners. Teachers at Bosque Farms are also lifelong learners and model this to help students see we never stop learning.

Using both formal and informal data helps us determine what direction to take in terms of upcoming learning and teaching opportunities. Each decision we make about student learning is based on the following questions; what does the data tell us about our student learners? What do our students need to be successful? What can we do to help them be most successful? It is through this process we offer curriculum which is hands on and investigative in style. Students are challenged to constantly question and offer insight to education problems, projects, and questions across subject areas. They are expected to think deeply about

important issues that are around them so they will see the need to be part of making a difference in our community and world. High expectations are placed upon students that they are always actively engaged and participating in the process of constructing ideas.

#### **2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:**

(This question is for elementary schools only)

Bosque Farms Elementary implemented a Comprehensive Literacy Framework which addresses the 6 essential components of reading instruction, as determined by the New Mexico Public Education Department; phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, and oral language development. As part of a workshop model, the framework contains a Reader's Workshop, Writer's Workshop, and a Language/Word Study block. Each workshop begins with a teacher guided mini-lesson and moves to a joint guided practice, which is observed in small guided reading/writing groups or by teacher-student conferences. Each workshop ends with a wrap-up or closure, which ties back to the workshop's mini-lesson. All mini-lessons are based on the New Mexico State Standards for Language Arts. Many times the mini-lessons are tied directly to real text through read alouds of familiar text. At times mini-lessons may involve shared reading opportunities or integration of digital media to engage students and enhance lessons. It is through this integration we are able to powerfully teach across curriculum.

Teachers align reading and writing lessons across curriculum in a variety of ways by choosing informational text and digital media to align with New Mexico State Science and Social Studies Standards. Teachers choose these materials for mini-lessons in Reader's and Writer's Workshop, guided reading groups, independent reading, and when conferencing to give an example of a lesson or strategy the student needs to learn. Teachers utilize technology in the form of Discovery Education's United Streaming and a program called Destination Success.

#### **3. Additional Curriculum Area:**

Bosque Farms Elementary uses an investigative math program called TERC Investigations for our kindergarten through fifth grade students and Connected Math for our sixth grade students. Both of these programs are investigative in nature. Investigative lessons are closely aligned to the New Mexico State Standards for Mathematics and support students to make sense of mathematics and foster mathematical thinkers. The implementation of this program has left some areas of instruction at levels that students might have already passed. In order to assure that our students have a complete understanding of the standards by the time they get to the sixth grade, our teachers examine where there are standards that need extra work and supplements their math lessons in these areas. Students learn that they are capable of having mathematical ideas, applying what they know to new situations, and thinking and reasoning about unfamiliar problems. Instruction is delivered in a workshop format. The lesson begins with a direct mini-lesson, moves to guided practice in which students work with peers and their teacher to investigate specific concepts, and then finish up with independent practice. Teachers are active participants in implementing each unit, observing, and listening carefully to students, trying to understand how they are thinking, and in turn making teaching decisions based on those observations. Our teachers use common planning time to design their program for the year. They have been using common assessments to pinpoint weak areas for the students and decide as a group how to address those areas.

#### **4. Instructional Methods:**

In addition to New Mexico State Standards, teachers at Bosque Farms Elementary rely on formal and informal data to drive their instruction. Walking into any classroom, one would see many opportunities of differentiation. Teachers differentiate instruction by giving modified assignments, verbal and tangible feedback, using questioning, student response and discussion activities at varying levels, graphic organizers, etc. Flexible grouping is seen when teachers work with students in small guided reading groups using data based DRA (Developmental Reading Assessment) and MAP (Measures of Academic Performance)

assessments, classroom based assessments, student work, and observational data. Even within the guided reading groups, teachers are modifying assignments and giving specific feedback to individual students. Conferencing in both reading and writing allow teachers an opportunity to work one-on-one with students to address their individual learning needs. We have both a School Leveled Library and each classroom has a leveled library. This allows teachers and students to choose text at each student's instructional and independent reading levels.

Teachers provide instruction in the Investigations math workshop by first providing direct instruction through the Investigations mini-lesson. Then, students work with peers to "try out" the new skill. During this time, teachers walk around the room observing and assisting students as needed. After students have tried out the skill with support, they move into independent application of the skill. Teachers continue to observe and offer support and differentiation through math conferences with students. To differentiate further, teachers use data from student work, common assessments, and other formative assessments such as the MAP, to create small guided math groups based on the needs of the students.

Team teaching is also utilized to differentiate instruction. Bosque Farms Elementary has built a Focused Learning Block into the school day that is school wide. Each grade level teacher works with his/her grade level colleagues to provide differentiated focused instruction for students who are needing opportunities for re-teaching (Tier I and Tier Ib), expansion and enrichment of curriculum (Tier I and Tier Ib), and re-learning (Tier II). Through co-planning and co-teaching teachers are able to meet the needs of all learners. Differentiation in the Focused Learning Block is in addition to the many opportunities throughout the school day, in which teachers provide modified or supplemented instruction to meet the needs of our diverse learners.

Our special needs students are instructed according to their individual IEP's. Teachers modify the grade level curriculum and also present lessons and curriculum from Orton/Gillingham, the Language! program and the Get Ahead Math program.

We have a pullout program for our gifted students. This program focuses on creating a more rigorous curriculum as well as to delve deeper in the subject matter of the existing curriculum. Our goals contribute to student learning and achievement by using broader and more complex strategies. With these strategies, students will use higher levels of thinking and develop a greater capacity to critically analyze real life problems. While developing their gifts and talents in an environment conducive to their special needs, our students learn social and collaboration skills that greatly impact their academic performance and self-esteem.

## **5. Professional Development:**

Professional development at Bosque Farms Elementary takes form in many different ways. One of the most powerful is through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). PLCs consist of like grade level colleagues, the academic coach, and at times the principal, SAT coordinator, and IEP facilitator. During PLCs teachers collaborate to analyze and improve classroom practice. We identify strengths and weaknesses of student learning and discuss how we can build upon them. PLC's are focused on results of student learning and we use data to look at data to set goals and determine next steps to increase student achievement. PLCs look at data in many ways from school wide, grade level, and individual class MAP data to common assessments created by specific grade level PLCs. We look for trends we are seeing in student learning, strengths we see and ways to maintain these strengths, and areas of need and ways to improve this. Part of our work in PLCs involves analyzing student performance and work samples from one another's class for the purpose of improving teaching and learning.

Other professional development opportunities can be seen through grade level, school, and district workshops or trainings. All professional development is driven by the result of data from student learning. Teachers are also given surveys to help the school provide professional development opportunities by the needs of students and teachers. At times professional development takes place during grade level PLCs, in which either the academic coach or one of the teachers share resources that help to improve teaching and learning. Mini

workshops called “Morning Lessons” take place before students arrive from 8:15-8:55 AM. These workshops address specific areas of comprehensive literacy, assessment, technology, investigative math, etc. The workshops are offered by the academic coach or other educators.

Using data from the MAP, DRA, and formative data from teachers, our school began implementation of the focused learning block. In order to get this implemented there was needed training in specific intervention programs and school-wide systems. This year much of the mini-workshops have been to address specific intervention resources for Tier II instruction. These workshops have been presented by many educators; one of the special education teachers, the technology teacher, SAT coordinator, IEP facilitator, and academic coach. Opportunities for collaboration have been offered to help bridge student learning through core curriculum and tier intervention programs. There have also been meetings and collaboration on “next steps” in terms of the processes we take through the tiered system to intervene.

## **6. School Leadership:**

At Bosque Farms Elementary, the leadership structure is evident. The Principal serves as the instructional leader, disciplinarian, mediator, evaluator, manager, cheerleader, and motivator. In addition, the school has a Curriculum Support Intervention team, which encompasses a teacher from every grade level, the IEP facilitator, academic coach, representation from special programs (staff from library and computer lab), and the principal. This group meets as needed to discuss issues ranging from curriculum, safety, and schedules to motivations for students and classroom practices. Input is received from all stakeholders before decisions that impact the school are made. The school has the atmosphere of a big family with the principal as a parent.

School leadership at Bosque Farms Elementary continuously sells and sustains the school’s collaboratively developed vision and mission through a means of ongoing staff conversations, collaborative development, achievement data reviews, and school improvement plans, collaboratively developed and monitored for student success. The students and staff both know the expectations of excellence and the consequences of not meeting those expectations. Operating within the confines of those expectations make it easier for everyone to succeed. Every program, policy, and fiscal resource goes into activities and materials that further student achievement. The entire staff is constantly focusing on what is best for students. It is evident in leadership that our students can and will attain academic excellence.

The quest for excellence is visible through the principal’s actions and interactions with instructional staff. The principal monitors instructional progress by regularly engaging in walkthroughs, classroom visits, student work evaluation, and multiple formative and summative data sources. Findings are shared and analyzed with staff. Leadership is also shown by developing teachers’ content knowledge by recognizing instructional leaders within the school, offering professional development with extensive classroom practice and support. Leadership at BFE provides encouragement, recognition, and support of teachers. Teacher expertise is encouraged to be shared with others; incentive systems exist to reward progress toward school wide goals. Administration adapts and modifies procedures, policy, and tools as needed to improve instruction with collaborative input from staff. BFE has a method for engaging the entire staff in analyzing and designing new practices based on prior initiatives, as well as a way to monitor the results of the school improvement effort and has cross disciplinary faculty committees with decision-making responsibility. Administration creates and maintains an orderly work environment. Uninterrupted instructional time is provided for core instruction.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: 3rd Grade Math

Edition/Publication Year: 1st Edition/printed each year

Publisher: Hartcort

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | May       | May       | May       | May       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 62        | 56        | 52        | 53        | 25        |
| % Advanced  | 14        | 6         | 10        | 2         | 3         |
| Number of students tested   | 65        | 64        | 63        | 61        | 67        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 24        | 26        | 36        | 52        | 57        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 4         | 0         | 1         | 1         | 4         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 0         | 0         | 1         | 3         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 53        | 45        | 41        | 39        | 16        |
| % Advanced  | 13        | 0         | 4         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 32        | 29        | 27        | 31        | 32        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 0         | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 68        | 60        | 50        | 56        | 17        |
| % Advanced  | 12        | 0         | 6         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 33        | 30        | 18        | 18        | 17        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           | 31        | 23        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           | 8         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 8         | 5         | 13        | 13        |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 1         | 5         | 1         | 2         |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           | 17        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 5         | 8         | 6         | 8         | 12        |

Notes: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment has just one edition for each grade that is the same every year with a minimum number of items refreshed. The alternative assessment is the NMAPA (New Mexico Alternative Proficiency Assessment). We have a class of D level special education students who are low enough to take this assessment. I provided the number of students tested in all categories asked for w/o data for those under 10. The last subgroup is our Native American subgroup.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: 3rd Grade Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 1st/Only edition/printed each year

Publisher: Hartcort

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 88        | 81        | 77        | 71        | 49        |
| % Advanced  | 17        | 27        | 3         | 15        | 3         |
| Number of students tested   | 65        | 64        | 52        | 65        | 67        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 24        | 26        | 30        | 56        | 57        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 4         | 0         | 1         | 1         | 4         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 0         | 0         | 1         | 3         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 81        | 76        | 59        | 58        | 37        |
| % Advanced  | 16        | 21        | 7         | 10        | 3         |
| Number of students tested   | 32        | 29        | 27        | 31        | 32        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 0         |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 85        | 87        | 72        | 78        | 41        |
| % Advanced  | 21        | 27        | 22        | 6         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 33        | 30        | 18        | 18        | 17        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           | 31        | 8         |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 8         | 5         | 13        | 13        |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 1         | 5         | 1         | 5         |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           | 33        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 5         | 8         | 6         | 8         | 12        |

Notes:

The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment has just one edition for each grade that is the same every year with a minimum number of items refreshed. The alternative assessment is the NMAPA (New Mexico Alternative Proficiency Assessment). We have a class of D level special education students who are low enough to take this assessment. I provided the number of students tested in all categories asked for w/o data for those under 10. The last subgroup is our Native American subgroup.



Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: 4th Grade Math

Edition/Publication Year: 1st Edition/printed each year

Publisher: Hartcourt

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 78        | 63        | 52        | 36        | 28        |
| % Advanced  | 25        | 9         | 10        | 7         | 2         |
| Number of students tested   | 68        | 56        | 63        | 56        | 51        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 25        | 22        | 36        | 48        | 42        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 1         | 1         | 1         | 4         | 3         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 0         | 0         | 1         | 3         | 3         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 68        | 47        | 46        | 18        | 28        |
| % Advanced  | 18        | 3         | 0         | 0         | 2         |
| Number of students tested   | 28        | 30        | 26        | 28        | 51        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 0         | 0         | 0         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 83        | 61        | 57        | 23        | 33        |
| % Advanced  | 28        | 9         | 13        | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 36        | 23        | 23        | 13        | 12        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 9         | 10        |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           | 0         | 0         |           |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 8         | 11        | 10        | 8         |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 4         | 3         | 3         | 1         |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           | 20        |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           | 0         |           |
| Number of students tested   | 7         | 8         | 9         | 10        | 3         |

Notes:

The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment has just one edition for each grade that is the same every year with a minimum number of items refreshed. The alternative assessment is the NMAPA (New Mexico Alternative Proficiency Assessment). We have a class of D level special education students who are low enough to take this assessment. I provided the number of students tested in all categories asked for w/o data for those under 10. The last subgroup is our Native American subgroup.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: 4th Grade Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 1st Edition/published each year

Publisher: Hartcourt

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 78        | 66        | 57        | 46        | 63        |
| % Advanced  | 28        | 5         | 3         | 13        | 8         |
| Number of students tested   | 68        | 56        | 63        | 56        | 51        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 25        | 22        | 36        | 48        | 43        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 1         | 1         | 1         | 4         | 3         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 0         | 0         | 1         | 3         | 3         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 68        | 57        | 39        | 29        | 55        |
| % Advanced  | 11        | 0         | 0         | 4         | 5         |
| Number of students tested   | 28        | 30        | 26        | 28        | 22        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 0         | 0         | 0         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 81        | 61        | 49        | 46        | 58        |
| % Advanced  | 25        | 4         | 0         | 0         | 8         |
| Number of students tested   | 36        | 23        | 23        | 13        | 12        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 18        | 20        |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           | 0         | 0         |           |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 8         | 11        | 10        | 8         |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 4         | 3         | 3         | 1         |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           | 20        |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           | 0         |           |
| Number of students tested   | 7         | 8         | 9         | 10        | 3         |

Notes:

The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment has just one edition for each grade that is the same every year with a minimum number of items refreshed. The alternative assessment is the NMAPA (New Mexico Alternative Proficiency Assessment). We have a class of D level special education students who are low enough to take this assessment. I provided the number of students tested in all categories asked for w/o data for those under 10. The last subgroup is our Native American subgroup.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: 5th Grade Math

Edition/Publication Year: 1st Edition/published each year

Publisher: Hartcourt

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Mar       | Mar       |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 73        | 58        | 54        |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 23        | 17        | 12        |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 64        | 76        | 50        |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested  | 23        | 30        | 29        |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 1         | 1         | 4         |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 0         | 0         | 2         |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 55        | 60        | 41        |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 17        | 5         | 0         |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 29        | 40        | 27        |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 0         | 0         | 0         |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 75        | 61        | 47        |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 36        | 18        | 0         |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 23        | 28        | 15        |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 7         | 8         |           |           |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 3         | 2         |           |           |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 60        |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 10        |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 10        | 9         | 9         |           |           |

Notes: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment has just one edition for each grade that is the same every year with a minimum number of items refreshed. The alternative assessment is the NMAPA (New Mexico Alternative Proficiency Assessment). We have a class of D level special education students who are low enough to take this assessment. I provided the number of students tested in all categories asked for w/o data for those under 10. The last subgroup is our Native American subgroup. There is no data for 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 because our school didn't have 5th graders until 2006-2007.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: 5 Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 1st/Published each year

Publisher: Hartcourt

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Mar       | Mar       |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 83        | 65        | 60        |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 36        | 16        | 28        |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 64        | 76        | 50        |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested  | 26        | 30        | 29        |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 1         | 1         | 4         |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 0         | 0         | 2         |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 69        | 58        | 52        |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 24        | 13        | 11        |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 29        | 40        | 27        |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 0         | 0         | 0         |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 82        | 64        | 47        |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 39        | 7         | 13        |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 28        | 28        | 15        | 0         |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 7         | 8         |           |           |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 3         | 2         | 0         |           |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 80        |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 30        |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 10        | 9         | 9         |           |           |

Notes: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment has just one edition for each grade that is the same every year with a minimum number of items refreshed. The alternative assessment is the NMAPA (New Mexico Alternative Proficiency Assessment). We have a class of D level special education students who are low enough to take this assessment. I provided the number of students tested in all categories asked for w/o data for those under 10. The last subgroup is our Native American subgroup. There is no data for 2004-2005 or 2005-2006 because our school didn't have 5th graders until 2006-2007.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6 Test: 6th Grade math

Edition/Publication Year: 1st Edition/Printed over each year

Publisher: Hartcourt

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Mar       |           |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 53        | 32        |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 13        | 9         |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 78        | 54        |           |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested  | 28        | 22        |           |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 1         | 4         |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 0         | 2         |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 50        | 27        | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % Advanced  | 3         | 7         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 40        | 30        | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % Advanced  |           |           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 52        | 29        | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % Advanced  | 7         | 6         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 29        | 17        | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % Advanced  |           |           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 8         | 6         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % Advanced  |           |           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           | 20        | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % Advanced  |           | 10        | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 8         | 10        | 0         | 0         | 0         |

Notes: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment has just one edition for each grade that is the same every year with a minimum number of items refreshed. The alternative assessment is the NMAPA (New Mexico Alternative Proficiency Assessment). We have a class of D level special education students who are low enough to take this assessment. I provided the number of students tested in all categories asked for w/o data for those under 10. The last subgroup is our Native American subgroup. There is no data for 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007 because our school didn't have 6th graders until 2007-2008.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6

Test: 6th Grade Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 1st Edition/printed over each year

Publisher: Hartcourt

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Mar       |           |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 53        | 50        |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 1         | 11        |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 78        | 54        |           |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested  | 28        | 22        |           |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 1         | 4         |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 0         | 2         |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 38        | 43        |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 0         | 10        |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 40        | 30        |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 0         | 0         |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 55        | 41        |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  | 0         | 6         |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 29        | 17        |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 8         | 6         |           |           |           |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 1         |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           | 30        |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           | 0         |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 8         | 10        |           |           |           |

Notes: The New Mexico Standards Based Assessment has just one edition for each grade that is the same every year with a minimum number of items refreshed. The alternative assessment is the NMAPA (New Mexico Alternative Proficiency Assessment). We have a class of D level special education students who are low enough to take this assessment. I provided the number of students tested in all categories asked for w/o data for those under 10. The last subgroup is our Native American subgroup. There is no data for 2004-2005, 2005-2006, or 2006-2007 because our school didn't have 6th graders until 2007-2008.